

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6. Indeed, “[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at \*1 (M.D. Ga.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is

appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Id.* “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate his prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Auth.*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997). Here, Green has raised no change in the law, newly discovered evidence, or clear error in the Court’s previous order.

Accordingly, Green’s motion for reconsideration (Doc. 18) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 22nd day of January, 2021.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, CHIEF JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT